



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,319	12/30/1999	BRIAN G. DUPERROUZEL	520044.403	6201

500 7590 05/10/2002

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/475,319

Applicant(s)

DUPERROUZEL ET AL.

Examiner

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to because the application filed lacks the necessary references to the related applications. A statement providing the serial number and filing date of the related applications should be entered following the title of the invention or as the first sentence of the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

a) line 11: the phrase "characteristics the web page" should be changed to --
characteristics of the web page--

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the storage area" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 18-19, 21-27, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams et al. ("Adams", US 6,237,030).

As per independent claim 1, Adams teaches a display system, including a display screen, to display web pages accessible via a network (Abstract, lines 1-3), the display system comprising:

a computer system structured to send a request for a web page via the network to a web site (col.8, line 67; col.9, lines 1-4), the computer system structured to receive the web page via the network from the web site (col.9, lines 36-39);

a display processor, responsive to display area controls associated with a display area on the display screen, to display the web page received by the computer system, the display area controls being responsive to a user to select characteristics of the web page to display in the display area (col.11, lines 6-11; *bookmark*); and

a storage area to store control information associated with the user-selected characteristics the web page displayed in the display area, wherein if the computer system sends a subsequent request to the web site for the web page, the display processor uses the stored

Art Unit: 2174

control information and the display area displays the web page received in response to the subsequent request in accordance with the user-selected characteristics of the web page (col.4, lines 48-52).

As per claim 4, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display area controls include addressing controls, the addressing controls being structured to allow the user to store an address of the displayed web page in the storage area for use during the subsequent request (col.4, lines 51-56).

As per claims 5-6, Adams teaches the display system wherein the computer system sends the subsequent request to the web site in response to a recall of the stored control information and wherein the computer system recalls the stored control information in response to the subsequent request (col.11, lines 19-21).

As per claim 7, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display area controls include sizing controls, the sizing controls being structured to allow the user to change a size of the display area (col.6, lines 6-7).

As per claim 9, Adams teaches the display system wherein the control information includes user-selected menu settings (col.5, lines 38-42).

Claims 10, 19 and 22 are individually similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 11, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display processor automatically processes the stored control information prior to displaying the user-selected characteristics of the web page (claim 1, lines 14-17).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claims 12 and 15, the limitations contained therein have been previously addressed in claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13-14 are similar in scope to claims 5-6 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 30 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 32 are individually similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23, 27 and 33 are individually similar in scope to claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, Adams teaches the display system further comprising a plurality of display areas configured to simultaneously display a corresponding plurality of web pages in accordance with corresponding user-selected characteristics of the web pages, the storage area storing control information corresponding to each display area, the display processor subsequently recalling the stored control information corresponding to each display area to simultaneously display the web pages in accordance with the user-selected characteristics of the web pages (col.11, lines 20-25).

Independent claim 25 is similar in scope to independent claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 24, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, Adams teaches the method wherein requesting a web page comprises connecting to an Internet network (col.10, lines 61-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 8, 16, 20, 28, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. ("Adams", US 6,237,030) in view of Malamud et al. ("Malamud", US 5,694,561).

As per claim 2, Adams teaches the display of web pages in response to display area controls associated with user-selected characteristics. However, Adams fails to teach the display area controls to include positioning controls being structured to allow the user to select a portion of the web page. Malamud teaches the display of a plurality of windows containing scroll bars, which are known to be used to select portions of the display area (col.2, line 35). In addition, Malamud teaches the storing of the display area allowing the user to close the display and make a subsequent request to open the stored display area (col.1, lines 42-48). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Malamud's teaching with Adams display system to provide more efficiency by reducing the time the user would take to return to the state at which the user left off.

Claims 8, 16, 20, 28, and 34 are individually similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

9. Claims 3, 17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. ("Adams", US 6,237,030) in view of Matthews, III et al. ("Matthews", US 6,344,865).

As per claim 3, Adams teaches the display of web pages in response to display area controls associated with user-selected characteristics. However, Adams fails to teach the display area controls to include screen resolution controls to adjust a screen resolution of the display screen. Matthews teaches the adjustment of the screen resolution of a display screen (col.11, lines 14-15). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Matthews teaching with Adams display system to adjust the display area to accommodate to the user's viewing level and/or preference.

Claims 17 and 29 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquiries

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (703) 305-3989. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
May 3, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100